

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

CHAD E. P.,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 24-cv-10329

Honorable Jonathan J.C. Grey

Magistrate Judge Anthony P. Patti

COMMISSIONER  
OF SOCIAL SECURITY,

Defendant.

\_\_\_\_\_ /

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION (ECF  
No. 16), DENYING PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR SUMMARY  
JUDGMENT (ECF No. 11), GRANTING DEFENDANT’S MOTION  
FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT (ECF No. 13), and AFFIRMING  
THE COMMISSIONER’S DECISION**

On February 8, 2024, Plaintiff Chad E. P. (“CEP” or “Parr”) filed this lawsuit challenging a final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security (the “Commissioner”) denying Parr’s claim for disability. (ECF No. 1.) On April 25, 2024, this Court referred the lawsuit to Magistrate Judge Anthony P. Patti for all pretrial proceedings, including a hearing and determination of all non-dispositive matters pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A) and/or a report and recommendation (“R&R”) on all dispositive matters pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B). (ECF No. 10.)

The parties subsequently filed cross-motions for summary judgment. (ECF Nos. 11, 13.)

This matter comes before the Court on Magistrate Judge Anthony P. Patti's Report and Recommendation dated February 7, 2025. (ECF No. 16.) In the Report and Recommendation, Judge Patti recommends denying Parr's motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 11), granting the Commissioner's motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 13), and affirming the decision of the Commissioner.

At the conclusion of the Report and Recommendation, Judge Patti advises the parties that they may object to and seek review of the Report and Recommendation, Parr filed objections on February 19, 2025. (ECF No. 17.) The Commissioner subsequently filed a response. (ECF No. 18.)

The Court finds that the objections merely raise arguments which were presented to Judge Patti and thus are not valid objections. Consequently, the Court **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation in full.

## **I. ANALYSIS**

When ruling on objections to a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation, the court must conduct a de novo review of portions of

the Report and Recommendation to which a party objects unless the objections are frivolous, conclusive, or general. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); *Smith v. Detroit Fed’n of Tchrs., Local 231*, 829 F.2d 1370, 1373 (6th Cir. 1987). A general objection, or one that merely restates the arguments previously presented, does not sufficiently identify alleged errors on the part of the magistrate judge. *Howard v. Sec’y of Health and Hum. Servs.*, 932 F.2d 505, 509 (6th Cir. 1991). An objection that does nothing more than disagree with a magistrate judge's findings, “without explaining the source of the error,” is not considered a valid objection. *Id.*

Parr objected to two of Judge Patti’s findings in the February 7, 2025, Report and Recommendation: (1) the finding that Parr failed to prove a medical need to use a cane when ambulating; and (2) the finding that Parr failed to prove an inability to use his left arm to independently initiate, sustain, and complete work-related activities involving fine and gross movements. (ECF No. 17, PageID.688.) The Court notes that the arguments in support of Parr’s objections merely reiterate arguments presented in his summary judgment brief. (*Compare* ECF No. 11, PageID.639–642, *with* ECF No. 17.)

That approach is not appropriate or sufficient, and the Court need not—and does not—address them in detail herein. *See, e.g., Howard*, 932 F.2d at 509; *O’Connell v. Comm’r of Soc. Sec.*, No. 14-13690, 2016 WL 537771, at \*1 (E.D. Mich. Feb. 11, 2016) (citing *Betancourt v. Ace Ins. Co. of P.R.*, 313 F.Supp.2d 32, 34 (D.P.R. 2004)). Judge Patti exhaustively addressed, and properly rejected, the arguments advanced by Parr. Furthermore, both objections are improperly general as Parr has not pointed to a specific deficiency in Judge Patti’s reasoning. Thus, the Court finds that Parr has not asserted any proper objections to the Report and Recommendation. Moreover, the Court agrees with Judge Patti’s analysis as to the issues challenged and, for the reasons set forth in the Report and Recommendation, Parr’s arguments are without merit. Accordingly, Parr’s objections are overruled.

## II. CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated above,

**IT IS ORDERED** that the Report and Recommendation dated February 7, 2025 (ECF No. 16) is **ADOPTED** as this Court’s findings of fact and conclusions of law.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Parr's objections to the February 7, 2025 Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 16) are **DENIED**.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Parr's motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 11) is **DENIED**.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the Commissioner's motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 15) is **GRANTED**.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the decision of the Commissioner is **AFFIRMED**.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that this case is **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**.

**SO ORDERED.**

Dated: March 11, 2025  
Judge

**s/Jonathan J.C. Grey**  
**JONATHAN J.C. GREY**  
United States District

**Certificate of Service**

The undersigned certifies that the foregoing document was served upon counsel of record and any unrepresented parties via the Court's ECF System to their respective email or First-Class U.S. mail addresses disclosed on the Notice of Electronic Filing on March 11, 2025.

s/ S. Osorio  
Sandra Osorio  
Case Manager